DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 426 CE 064 133

TITLE	Advanced Military Studies Programs at the Command and Staff Colleges. Hearings before the Military Education Panel of the Committee on Armed Services. House of Representatives, One Hundred Second Congress, Second Session (May 12 and July 23, 1992).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Armed Services.
REPORT NO	HASC-102-80; ISBN-0-16-040960-8
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	42p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; *Degree Requirements; *Educational Improvement; Graduate Study; Hearings; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; *Masters Degrees; *Military Training; Standards
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 102nd

ABSTRACT

This document reports the written and oral testimony given at two congressional hearings investigating the possibilities and methods for having degrees granted at military intermediate service schools and master's degrees granted at the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Officials testifying included high-ranking military officers, educational officials, and officials of accreditation organizations. Witnesses stated the advantages of degree-granting authority and pressed for Congress to authorize that facility, as one step in the accreditation process. Those who testified noted earlier efforts at accreditation for other military institutions and stressed that Congress had to grant degree-granting authority before the accrediting organizations would rule on standards for accreditation. Most of the testimony stressed the high quality of the military institutions and argued for passage of degree-granting authority for them. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359426

[H.A.S.C. No. 102–80]

ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAMS AT THE COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGES

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

MILITARY EDUCATION PANEL

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARINGS HELD
MAY 12, AND JULY 23, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE 064 133

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
67-260 CC WASHINGTON : 1993

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-040960-8

MILITARY EDUCATION PANEL

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

OWEN B. PICKETT, Virginia
MICHAEL R. McNULTY, New York
GLEN BROWDER, Alabama
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
CHET EDWARDS, Texas
RONALD K. MACHTLEY, Rhode Island
BEN BLAZ, Guam
(vacancy)

ARCHIE D. BARRETT, *Professional Staff Member*
ANNE E. FORSTER, *Staff Assistant*
AUSTIN MILLER, *GAO Staff*

(II)

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF HEARINGS

1992

	Page
Tuesday, May 12, Degree Granting at Intermediate Service Schools	1
Thursday, July 23, Authorizing the National Defense University to Award Master's Degrees to Graduates of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces	23

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Skelton, Hon. Ike, a Representative from Missouri, Chairman, Military Education Panel	1, 23

PRINCIPAL WITNESSES WHO APPEARED IN PERSON OR SUBMITTED WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Baldwin, Vice Adm. John A., Jr., President, National Defense University	30
Childers, John B., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Higher Education, U.S. Department of Education:	
Statement	28
Prepared statement	35
Jones, Paul L., Director, Defense Force Management Issues, National Security and International Offices Division, General Accounting Office: Prepared statement	24
Larson, Maj. Gen. George W., Jr., Commandant, Industrial College of the Armed Forces	31
Pappas, Steven G., Executive Director, National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility:	
Statement	28
Prepared statement	36
Savarda, Brig. Gen. James S., Commandant, Air Command and Staff College, U.S. Air Force:	
Statement	9
Prepared statement	11
Stadler, Maj. Gen. Gerald P., Former Commandant, National War College	31
Steele, Brig. Gen. William M., Deputy Commandant, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College:	
Statement	2
Prepared statement	5
Vetter, Col. David A., U.S. Marine Corps, Director, Marine Corps Command and Staff College	13

DEGREE GRANTING AT INTERMEDIATE SERVICE SCHOOLS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
MILITARY EDUCATION PANEL,
Washington, DC, Tuesday, May 12, 1992.

The panel met, pursuant to call, at 9:05 a.m. in room 2216, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ike Skelton (chairman of the panel) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. IKE SKELTON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, MILITARY EDUCATION PANEL

Mr. SKELTON. The panel will come to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to welcome you to this morning's hearing by the Panel on Military Education. Today, we will be discussing the Advanced Military Studies Programs at the Army, Air, and Marine Corps Command and Staff Colleges and the procedures for obtaining degree granting authority.

The panel is quite pleased by the Advanced Military Studies Program concept and I commend the Army Command and General Staff College for its vision in initially establishing the school of advanced military studies at Fort Leavenworth. Of course, we all know that the real stamp of approval came when General Schwarzkopf requested that SAMS graduates, sometimes referred to as "Jedi Knights," be sent to his headquarters in Riyadh to assist in developing the campaign plan.

The panel does not intend to evaluate these programs to determine if they meet the requirements to award advanced degrees. That is properly the responsibility of State and national accrediting organizations. The panel's role is to establish the procedures necessary for congressional approval.

In 1989, upon the request of the Naval War College for degree granting authority, the panel established the following criteria and procedures: One, obtain approval from the appropriate regional accrediting organization; two, complete evaluation by the National Advisory Committee of Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility; and, three, obtain approval from the Department of Education.

Once the school has met the accreditation requirements, the panel also considers the following: One, how degree granting authority will affect the military education mission of the school; and, two, how this will affect the number of officers obtaining advanced degrees from civilian schools.

Before we hear from the witnesses, I would like to digress slightly. One of the panel's primary goals has been to encourage a schol-

arly environment at our PME schools, as you know. Academic freedom is a major aspect of such an environment. The panel reaffirms its belief that Department of Defense review of speeches and articles by faculty and students detracts from the necessary academic freedom at PME schools.

The witnesses this morning are Brig. Gen. James Savarda, Commandant of the Air Command and Staff College; Brig. Gen. William M. Steele, Deputy Commandant of the Army Command and General Staff College; and, I would like welcome here an old hand at these hearings, an old friend, Col. David Vetter, who is Director, Marine Corps Command and Staff College.

Gentlemen, thank you for joining us this morning. We are off to a slow start. There is a markup at 10 o'clock in a subcommittee that some of us must attend, so I would ask you to make your remarks as briefly as possible, so we will have time for questions.

Mr. Machtley.

Mr. MACHTLEY. In the interest of time, I have no opening statement.

Mr. SKELTON. OK. We will start with the Army first, and General Steele.

STATEMENTS OF BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM M. STEELE, DEPUTY COMMANDANT, U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE; ACCOMPANIED BY BOB KUPIZEWSKI, CURRICULUM COORDINATOR DOCTOR, PHIL BROOKES, DIRECTOR, GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS, COL. JIM MCDONOUGH, DIRECTOR, ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES; ACCOMPANIED BY COL. DENNIS DREW, DEAN, SAAS, COL. DONALD ORLANDO, ASSOCIATE DEAN, MAJ. JEFF BRUENIG, JOINT DEPARTMENT, AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE, ACSC

General STEELE. Mr. Skelton, I have a prepared opening statement, I would like to submit for the record.

Mr. SKELTON. Let the record show all prepared statements will be submitted and set forth in the record without objection, and you may summarize.

General STEELE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Panel on Military Education, I am pleased to appear before you today in response to your letter of April 22 in which you express interest in the conduct of accredited, master's degree study at our Nation's intermediate level service schools.

Because we have had nearly 16 years of successful experience with our college's accredited Master of Military Art and Science degree, my remarks today will focus on our program.

Our MMAS program, as we call it, took root in 1961 when then-Commandant and later Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, directed that the college determine the feasibility of graduate level military study.

CGSC leaders soon learned that for the master's degree to be legitimate we had to win congressional authorization and regional accreditation. Gaining congressional authorization took CGSC a decade of program experimentation and refinement culminating in congressional approval in 1974. The path to accreditation was not as difficult as receiving congressional approval.

Mr. SKELTON. We were always a little tough.

General STEELE. Yes, sir. But it was just as lengthy. Only when congressional authority was finally secured in 1974 did CGSC finally gain full accreditation from our accreditation authority, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, or NCA.

Today this panel can greatly facilitate the congressional approval process of our sister service intermediate level schools by reducing this 11-year wait required during our own approval process at CGSC.

The MMAS program's founders developed a degree for student volunteers in our 10-month Command and General Staff School, or CGSS. Candidates for the degree undertake a demanding regimen of thesis research and writing, in addition to their regular course work. They must meet all CGSS standards for graduation and fulfill the MMAS program's extra requirements.

In the end, each must produce a thoroughly researched and properly documented thesis, defend it before a faculty committee, and pass a 2-hour oral comprehensive examination.

Mr. Chairman, from your own experience as a law student at the University of Missouri, sir, I am sure you will recall the demands placed on adult learners pursuing a professional degree. Based on those recollections, you can imagine the challenge our students accept in adding our master's program to a tough regular course of study that daily commits them to more than 5 hours of formal classes, practical exercises, examinations, laboratories, speaking and writing requirements, and electives.

Our students will tell you, frankly, that it is akin to being enrolled in two graduate programs simultaneously. This year 94 students are completing the work for our MMAS degree within the CGSS. That more than doubles the program's former output. This increase reflects, we think, the program's maturing over the years, its utility to the officer and the United States Army, and its increasing representation as a number of those holding the degree increases.

In 1983, our school for advanced military studies, or SAMS, was established to afford select CGSS graduates a second year for in-depth study in the operational art. From the beginning, we extended the MMAS program to include SAMS students. While MMAS participation is voluntary for CGSS students in the 10-month course, SAMS students must complete a degree requirement as part of the extra rigor that we demand of them.

As carefully selected as CGSS students are, our 52 SAMS students are even more rigorously screened. In fact, only CGSS graduates and a few sister service counterparts may apply, and even then only about one in four are actually accepted into SAMS. The original reasons for integrating MMAS and SAMS were several, and we think they are still valid today.

Most importantly, we wanted our SAMS students and their services to earn the great return on the SAMS education. Second, the general aims of the MMAS program and those of the SAMS program have much in common, we feel. They both require superior students, a more challenging educational experience, independent inquiry, and the development of an uncommon intellectual prowess.

Finally, we found that each offering, both the MMAS program and SAMS, had something of value for the other. On the one hand, SAMS benefits from incorporating MMAS and NCA accreditation standards into its already rigorous program, while the students benefit from earning a master's degree. On the other hand, the MMAS program gains strength from participation by excellent SAMS students and faculty.

After almost a decade of this shared enterprise, the decision to link MMAS and SAMS has proved the wise one. The Army has experienced several payoffs in this regard. We found that the intellectual refinement stimulated by study that complies with accreditation standards to be a great payoff for us. Another payoff is the monographs written by the SAMS students. They generate great discussion far beyond the walls of SAMS.

The appeal of earning an accredited master's degree in the profession of arms also encourages our better students of CGSS to apply for the SAMS program in the second year of study. We have also found that the SAMS program and its linkage with MMAS has given a rediscovery of the operational level of war within the Army, most recently illustrated by the participation of SAMS graduates in the planning and execution of Operations Just Cause, Desert Shield and Desert Storm, where SAMS graduates were involved in every level of the planning and execution of those campaigns.

The School and degree program have contributed heavily to the revolution in education, training and warfighting abilities of our army significantly within the last 10 years since the school existed.

A sixth payoff is the many improvements the SAMS program and the MMAS program have caused in our library in order for us to meet accreditation standards of the NCA. Those payoffs in the library are available to a wide range of users in the college, and we have incalculable further benefits from those improvements to meet accreditation standards.

Finally, a seventh reward resulting from the MMAS programming has been the college's enhanced standing in the academic world. As an accredited graduate school, we are able to exchange credits with other civilian institutions. We have formal cooperative master's degree programs with several other graduate schools in our area, and our faculty now represents an accredited graduate degree granting school at their professional meetings.

Over the years, the college's experience with graduate level accreditation has taught us that accrediting agencies support our institutional goals by bringing to bear their reasonable but challenging accreditation standards to our military environment and military education system. Therefore, America's military schools have everything to gain and much to contribute by meeting these accreditation standards.

Judging from the affirmations received by our accreditation authority, NCA, and other reviews, such as the Army Audit Agency and the GAO, we feel our master's program has achieved its purposes from the very beginning. As we look to the challenges of the years ahead, advanced education and research in military art and science grows even more important from our perspective, and for this reason, most of all, I believe the Army's early investment in its accredited master's degree program has been sound.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my opening remarks. I brought with me three other members of our college staff.

Mr. SKELTON. Do you wish to identify them?

General STEELE. Sir, I have Mr. Bob Kupizewski with us, who is a curriculum coordinator at the college and is responsible for JPME, Phase I.

Mr. SKELTON. If you would stand, please.

General STEELE. Bob, if you will stand up, please.

Mr. SKELTON. Nice to see you.

General STEELE. Sir, I have Dr. Phil Brookes, who is our Director of Graduate Degree Programs at the college, and has been with the program since 1979; and our third member that is with us is Col. Jim McDonough, who is the Director of our School for Advanced Military Studies.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you so much.

General STEELE. We stand by to answer your questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM M. STEELE

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Skelton, Members of the Panel on Military Education: I am pleased to appear before you today, in response to your letter of April 22d, in which you expressed interest in the conduct of accredited, master's-degree study on military subjects at our Nation's intermediate-level service schools. As you know, since academic year 1975–76 the Army has awarded an accredited degree—the Master of Military Art and Science (MMAS)—to selected students at the Command and General Staff College (CGSC). Because we have had nearly 16 years of successful experience with CGSC's master's degree, my remarks today will focus on our program.

II. MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE DEFINED

Most true professions—e.g., law, medicine, and education—have a correlative scholarly field, in which study of the past, inquiry into the present, and speculation about the future help define and advance the frontiers of knowledge. As a practical matter, the Army defines the discipline, Military Art and Science, as the study of the application of military power, in peace and war, to the attainment of national objectives. This description, serving as the operational definition for the MMAS program, confines topics for student investigation to those that are clearly military in nature, while providing reasonable latitude to conduct research on any related military subject. Drafted at the program's inception, this broad definition has served unchanged.

III. ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

Our MMAS program took root in 1961, when then-Commandant, later Chief of Staff of the Army, Harold K. Johnson directed that the college determine the feasibility of conferring a master's degree for graduate-level military study. According to an Oral History interview with Dr. Ivan Birrer, Educational Advisor to General Johnson, Army leaders had conjectured for some time that CGSC's position in the Army school system, the complexity of its subject matter, and the sophistication of its students might support granting a master's degree.

The three-fold purpose of the MMAS degree program was to: (1) enhance the reputation of military studies as an academic discipline, (2) increase student learning, and (3) add to the college's prestige in the Army and throughout American higher education. For the degree to be legitimate, CGSC had to win congressional authorization and regional accreditation. The precedent for congressional authorization had been set in the 1920's, when Congress awarded degree-granting authority to the U.S. Military and Naval Academies. It was confirmed after World War II when similar authority was extended to the Air Force Academy, the Naval Postgraduate School, and the Air Force Institute of Technology.

Seeking congressional authorization, CGSC embarked on a decade of program experimentation and refinement, which was complicated by conflicting views within

the Defense community over the value and propriety of the MMAS degree. These differences took root in the enduring debate over the proper place, if any, of the Federal Government in higher education. Positions were dramatized, in the political climate of the day, by national divisions over the conduct of the Vietnam war, particularly divisions between the military and academic communities. Finally, in 1974, after a decade of unsuccessful effort and in response to a coalition led by Senator Harold Hughes, of Iowa, Congress granted CGSC authority to confer the MMAS degree.

The path to accreditation was not as difficult as receiving congressional approval, but it was just as lengthy. The college received preliminary accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (the appropriate regional accrediting agency) in 1963, with full accreditation contingent on gaining congressional authority. The three-part procedure for getting accreditation was much as it is today. First, CGSC completed a comprehensive self-study and report embracing all key aspects of operations: faculty, admissions, academic programs, nonacademic programs, facilities, governance, budget, and student life. Then came an on-site visit by an NCA inspection team, followed by further questioning from the Association's review committee at their headquarters in Chicago. Because of the delay in receiving congressional approval, our preliminary accreditation was withdrawn in 1965. Only when that authority was at last secured, 11 years later, did CGSC again approach the NCA, complete a second self-study, and at last gain full accreditation. The history of our MMAS Program shows accreditation was a significant challenge, but winning congressional approval to grant the degree was the most difficult part of the process. Today this committee can greatly facilitate gaining congressional approval for our sister service intermediate level schools and reduce the 11-year wait required during our approval process.

Since initial accreditation the college has won two 5-year accreditation renewals and one 10-year renewal—this latter the maximum term granted by the NCA. Our next regularly scheduled NCA comprehensive review will culminate in 1995, and early preparations for it are already underway.

IV. PROGRAM OPERATION

The MMAS program's founders conceived the degree for student volunteers in our "first-year," 10-month Command and General Staff School (CGSS). Participants are Active, Reserve, International, and Sister Service officers, 25 percent of whom already hold at least one master's or higher degree. A small number—perhaps a dozen annually—are Reserve component officers (total 21) and international officers (total 83) while about two dozen annually are sister-service officers (totals USMC 32; USN 12; USAF 144). CGSS candidates for the degree undertake a demanding regimen of study in addition to their regular course work. They must meet all CGSS standards for graduation and, in addition, fulfill the MMAS Program's extra requirements, which include selecting a concentration in Military History, Joint Planning, Force Development, Strategy, or General Studies. Students also must earn a B or better in all courses, submit an acceptable thesis prospectus, engage a qualified faculty thesis research committee, and comply with a demanding, year-long schedule of deadlines. International officers must also pass an advanced English writing skills test.

In the end, each student must produce a thoroughly researched and properly documented thesis, defend it before the faculty committee, and pass a 2-hour oral comprehensive examination administered by a separate faculty board. Along the way, they take three research methods courses (one each of our three terms) consisting of lectures, library exercises, presentations of their work in progress, and faculty consultations. Throughout the programs, faculty are chosen based on their subject matter expertise and interest in the topic proposed. As a means of quality control, each thesis research committee must include one member who holds a doctoral degree. To help meet this requirement, CGSC enlists the support of civilian university professors who possess both doctoral degrees and Reserve component commissions.

From your own experience as a law student at the University of Missouri, Sir, I'm sure you can recall the demands placed on adult learners pursuing a professional degree. Based on those recollections, you can imagine the challenge our students accept in adding our thesis-centered master's program to a tough regular course of study that daily commits them to more than 5 hours of formal classes, practical exercises, examinations, labs, speaking and writing requirements, and electives. The students will tell you frequently that it's akin to being enrolled in two graduate programs simultaneously.

The attrition rate for CGSS MMAS candidates annually ranges between 25 and 33 percent. This year, 131 students submitted prospecti in September, and 95 are

now completing work for the degree. These figures, like others for the past few years, represent more than a doubling of the program's former output (about 40 annually). We think this increase reflects the program's maturing over the years, its utility to the officer and the Army, and its increasing reputation.

V. SAMS INCLUSION

In 1983, our School of Advanced Military Studies was established to afford select CGSS graduates a second year devoted to an in-depth study of operational art. SAMS studies have five major components: Theoretical Foundations; Tactical Dynamics; Contemporary Practice of Operational Art; Historical Practice of Operational Art; and Preparing for War.

In the first component, students are exposed to a broad variety of theories concerning the nature of war, the practice of war, the causes of war, and a small amount of political science. The second component entails a detailed study of the dynamics of tactical warfare from battalion to corps level. The third component provides the student with a practical understanding of the operational art through exercises, case studies, and discussions with practitioners. The fourth component is interwoven with the third to provide the student with a historical basis of the operational art. The fifth component requires the student to synthesize the lessons from the other four components into a vision of future warfare (extracted from Vince Brooks 92 SAMS monograph, pages 17–18). Although the MMAS degree originally was conceived for CGSS students, we extended the program to include SAMS students when the school was founded. While MMAS participation is voluntary for CGSS students, SAMS students must complete degree requirements as part of the extra rigor demanded of them. Although most SAMS MMAS requirements emulate those of the CGSS program, the writing requirement was modified early in the program's history (1985) to focus it upon the school's dual interests in advanced tactics and operational art. In place of the single thesis, the SAMS student writes two monographs—one at each level.

It is important to understand at this juncture that, as carefully selected as CGSC students are, comprising the top 50 percent or so of their year-groups, our 52 SAMS students are even more rigorously screened. Only CGSS graduates, and a few Sister Service counterparts, may apply. Of the volunteers, only about one out of four are accepted, and then only after a thorough review of the candidate's military personnel file, an examination, a battery of tests to evaluate reading and writing skills, a written essay, and a personal interview. Final selections are made by a board of senior CGSC military and civilian officials. The resulting list of principal and alternate selectees is then referred to the Army's and Sister Services' personnel managers to assure that all selections represent the best investment for the officers and their services.

The reasons for integrating MMAS and SAMS were several. First and most important, we wanted our SAMS students—and the service—to earn the greatest return on SAMS education. Second, the general aims of the established MMAS program and those of the new SAMS program had much in common. They attract superior students, provide them a more challenging educational experience, involve them in independent inquiry, require documentation of investigations in a written argument, and return to the rest of the Army an officer of uncommon intellectual prowess. Finally, we saw that both offerings had something of value for the other. On one hand, the new school would benefit from incorporating MMAS and NCA standards into its rigorous new program, while its students would benefit from earning the master's degree. On the other hand, the established MMAS program would gain from participation by excellent SAMS students and faculty.

After almost a decade of this shared enterprise, the decision to link MMAS and SAMS has proved a wise one. It has provided at least three significant payoffs to the Army. First, students and faculty alike attest to the intellectual refinement stimulated by research and writing conducted in compliance with accreditation standards. These skills, along with the improved analytical powers that accompany them, expand the SAMS graduate's value to the Army in future assignments. Second, the two monographs written by each SAMS student as one requirement for the degree—many of them later shared with key Army leaders—have in turn stimulated discussion and debate beyond SAMS itself on a variety of educational, doctrinal, and other contemporary military issues. Third, the intrinsic appeal of earning an accredited master's degree in one's chosen profession—in this case the profession of arms—helps encourage our better students to apply for the SAMS program. Because our SAMS graduates go on to serve the Army in key assignments, initially as Division and Corps Operations and Plans officers, this influence tends to be self-regenerating.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI. PAYOFFS

The net result of the SAMS–MMAS combination has been the rediscovery of the operational level of war. The production of officers able to plan and execute campaigns across the spectrum of war, now and into the future—the explicit mission of SAMS—has contributed to the maturing professionalism of our military.

Most of this advance has been quietly accomplished, the effects permeating the military gradually at first, and then with increasing rapidity. Many commanders and planners who had been through the SAMS–MMAS programs served in both Panama and the Gulf. Some served as chief plans officers and intelligence officers for the 18th Airborne Corps in Operation Just Cause. In Operation Desert Storm, SAMS students and former faculty took charge of the principal planning unit, which in turn contained four majors, also SAMS graduates. Many others served in other roles: commanding an armored cavalry regiment that led the 7th Corps attack; commanding an infantry battalion that fought with the Marines in Kuwait; serving as a brigade operations officer with the 24th Infantry; and performing the major logistical planning for the division. In all, some eighty other officers with similar backgrounds fought in the desert.

These are the dramatic moments, but a wider benefit of SAMS study has come from the broadened knowledge, the shared conceptual language, and the deeper professionalism that came from contact with other military leaders. The small experiment begun in a former stable at Fort Leavenworth once used by Buffalo Soldiers—an experiment that was immediately joined with the MMAS degree program—has brought about a major change in thinking about war within our military. That change has contributed to the revolution in education, training, and warfighting abilities of our Army that has unfolded in the past 10 years. Our students' investigations provide the college, the Army, and the wider research community a variety of scholarly products with both direct and indirect value to the American military.

The MMAS program also has fostered many improvements in our library, which in turn is available to a wide range of users. In the words of our library Director, graduate study and our library are inseparable.

A less tangible reward resulting from the MMAS program has been the college's enhanced standing in the academic world. As an accredited graduate school, we are able to exchange academic credits with other institutions. For years we have had formal cooperative degree programs with several other graduate schools, leading to master's degrees in officer specialty-related disciplines. These are Kansas University, Kansas State University, The University of Missouri at Kansas City, Wichita State University, and the Florida Institute of Technology. Our faculty who take active part in professional academic meetings represent an accredited graduate degree-granting school. CGSC's name appears with those of other accredited schools on the NCA's widely circulated list of member institutions.

VII. STANDARDS

Over the years, CGSC's experience with graduate-level accreditation has taught us that accrediting agencies support institutional goals by bringing to bear their reasonable but challenging accreditation standards, the wisdom of long experience in American higher education, practical frameworks for solving contemporary problems, and imaginative visions of tomorrow's challenges and opportunities. America's military schools have everything to gain, and much to contribute, by meeting the accepted standards of voluntary accreditation.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Judging from the affirmations received from our accreditation body (the NCA), our distinguished Advisory Committee, and additional Army and other Federal reviews (for example, Army Audit Agency and General Accounting Office), our masters' program has achieved its purposes from the beginning. CGSC students have written 1020 MMAS theses and 624 scholarly monographs in topic areas important to the Army's mission. Of the theses, the largest number, 244, have explored tactical and operational subjects; 185 have examined personnel, training, and administrative issues; 153 have focused on military history and biography; 121 have looked into logistical support; 110 have concerned aviation; 98 have dealt with leadership and command; 59 have centered on strategic issues; and 50 develop foreign area topics. A similar sorting of SAMS monograph topics shows their diversity of specialized focus: history, tactics, doctrine, logistics, military theory, coalition warfare, political-military affairs, unconventional warfare, peacekeeping, intelligence, technology, other nations' forces, and joint operations.

Many of those holding the MMAS degree have risen to prominent positions in the Army and recall their master's work as a valuable part of their preparation. As we look to the challenges of the years ahead, continuing advanced education and research in our own discipline—Military Art and Science—grows more important. The Army's investment in its accredited master's-degree program has been sound.

Mr. SKELTON. Next is Brig. Gen. James Savarda. This is your maiden voyage before this panel. We will make it as painless as possible. That has not always been true, as Colonel Vetter will undoubtedly tell you privately.

We welcome you, sir, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. JAMES S. SAVARDA, COMMANDANT, AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

General SAVARDA. Mr. Chairman, and members of the panel, I am pleased to have the opportunity to briefly express my views on the need for degree-granting authority to the School of Advanced Airpower Studies, or SAAS.

I have provided a more detailed statement to be submitted as testimony.

Degree-granting authority is needed to gain the full benefits of the success story in military education. SAAS is our investment in the enlightened education leadership, armed with a mastery of airpower. The Air Force recognized that need in 1988, when the Chief of Staff endorsed the plan and told this panel he would form the school. This panel supported that decision and the first student started class in July of 1991.

There is also strong support from the Air Force leadership. Our actions reflect the pervasive belief this school must be "done right" because our graduates will indeed help shape the Air Force of tomorrow.

Our charter leads inescapably to a course with all the attributes of a graduate degree program. It cannot be a training center. There is no right way to develop, apply, or refine airpower in the world. Nor can it be a traditional school of professional military education, with a broad effort to increase the competence of a diverse group of officers. Rather, we guide a small selective group in an extraordinarily deep study leading to the mastery of air strategy.

It all begins with our mission statement; to develop warrior/scholars who have the education to become the air strategists of the future. No other institution, military or civilian, can meet that mission.

Faculty of extraordinary quality builds, teaches, and maintains the curriculum by staying at the forefront of ideas on war and airpower. All are respected and widely published Ph.D.s.

Curriculum incorporates seven themes air strategists must understand in depth. Students begin by studying the evolution of airpower in the context of military history. Because airpower is applied by people, the human dimension of airpower is the second major theme.

The third theme, the development and application of airpower in various national cultures and geographic theatres deepen students' understanding of the history and the context from which threats emerge. Class members wrestle with interrelationships with technology, organization, theory, doctrine, and practice.

The fifth theme, overlapping strategic, operational and tactical operations of airpower, is a natural transition to the main emphasis of the school: The uses of airpower across the operational spectrum. Throughout, the students learn and use a variety of conceptual and analytical tools, and the curriculum reflects small no-holds barred graduate colloquia as a rule.

Each student is a volunteer with an exceptional professional and academic record. All are recent graduates of an intermediate service school in residence, and we require academic potential, appropriate career experience and indicators that future career paths would place students in positions where they would use the special education we provide.

The right students, taught by the right faculty, using the most effective methodologies, guided by well-qualified senior officers all have strong support. Senior decisionmakers are placing our graduates in key joint and Air Force billets to help shape the use of airpower. We want our senior leadership to have confidence that we will continue to improve.

Giving our university the authority to grant degrees to our graduates is the next logical step. The degree recognizes the special credentials our graduates and our faculty have obtained. Our degree will compare favorably with any from a fine civilian postgraduate school. Our Board of Visitors reaffirmed that. Deans, presidents, full professors, and leaders in education and business could offer no improvements to SAAS, even after an exhaustive look.

Degree-granting authority is the stepping stone to high-quality accreditation. Accreditation is a minute examination of our plans for continued institutional effectiveness, but our accrediting association requires that we first have authority to grant a degree before seeking accreditation.

We have sought such authority from the first. We are following the procedures that the panel outlined last year and the ones prescribed by the administration. The process has helped us capture what's best, improve what we can, and plan for the future.

Degree-granting authority underwrites our investment in a high-quality Air Force. No matter which alternative Air Force you envision in a future filled with uncertainties, such a force must be guided by airpower thinkers and strategists, for it will be those warriors, airmen, and scholars who will have a key role in exploring the reasoned paths to continued national security.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my opening remarks, and I have, too, brought some gentlemen with me from the School of Advanced Airpower Studies.

Mr. SKELTON. Yes, General, would you be kind enough to introduce those folks?

General SAVARDA. Sir, we have Col. Dennis Drew, who is the dean of SAAS; Col. Donald Orlando, who is the associate dean working the accreditation issue; and Maj. Jeff Bruenig, who works in the joint department, Air Command and Staff College, ACSC.

Mr. SKELTON. That is the most important of all; right?

General SAVARDA. Yes, sir.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. JAMES S. SAVARDA

Mr. Chairman and members of the panel, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the Department's progress and efforts toward obtaining degree-granting authority for advanced study programs at the Air Force's School of Advanced Airpower Studies or SAAS. When fully accredited, the school will provide the full benefit of what has already proven to be a success story in military education. In the future SAAS will provide our best investment for ensuring an enlightened and educated leadership armed with a mastery of airpower.

Our school is new; we will graduate our first class in just over 2 weeks. But the idea behind those young airpower strategists rests upon a historical precedent of great soundness. During the lean years of the Great Depression, the Air Corps Tactical School was founded not a mile from our school. It was the center for the creative thinking that shaped the aerial victories of World War II. The in-depth study, the exchange and testing of ideas, the research and writing done there prepared our senior leaders well. All of the Army Air Force four-star generals and 11 of the 13 three-star generals in World War II were graduates of that school. Today's Air Force is obligated also to prepare a group of warrior/scholar/airman to develop and apply airpower strategy.

Air University recognized that need in early 1988 and commissioned a special group to study the feasibility of such a school. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Larry D. Welch, endorsed the plan and told this panel that he would form the school. Air University provided recommendations and, on 21 April 1989, this panel suggested such a "course be established in the near future." We wasted no time. By the fall of that year planning had intensified and we began a far-ranging search for faculty with the special qualifications and experience such a school demanded. By June 1990, the first of the faculty was hired and they immediately plunged into the business of building a 45-week course. Meanwhile, senior faculty members at Air University began scanning records of potential students for a central board of general officers to consider. That board met in the spring of 1990. It was difficult for them to choose just 25 officers from the 80 outstanding records they reviewed. They did, however, and the first students started class on 22 July 1991.

There is a central thread I want you to draw from that brief history: there was then, and there is now, strong support for the school from the Air Force leadership. Now, as I describe what the school is today, you will see another central idea reflected in the actions of everyone involved in breathing life into the vision our leaders provided. That idea is simply this: this school must be "done right" because Air Force leadership recognizes our graduates will help shape the Air Force of tomorrow.

The very nature of that charter leads inescapably to a course with all the attributes of a graduate degree program. But before I discuss details, let me compare the school with other military programs to highlight how our mission statement, faculty, curriculum, methodologies, staff, and facilities all work to meet a specific need for officers to master the art and science of airpower.

First, the school is not a training center. There is no "right" way to develop, apply, and refine airpower in war. Nor is it a traditional school of professional military education, with a broad effort to increase the competence of a diverse group of officers. Rather, our school guides a small, select group in an extraordinarily deep study leading to mastery of air strategy. It all begins with our mission statement.

This mission statement guides every action, shapes every policy, motivates every person to turn vision into reality. That vision is to develop warrior/scholars who have the education to become the air strategists of the future. No other institution, military or civilian, can meet that mission. So, one of our first tasks was to assemble a faculty of extraordinary quality.

We had to have such a strong faculty because they do more than teach the curriculum. They built it. They must continue to maintain it through the force of their intellect, in a constant search to stay at the forefront of ideas on war and the application of airpower to wage war. Half are military officers; half are civilians. All have earned Ph.D.s in appropriate areas. All are respected and widely published authors. All divide their time equally in shaping their curriculum, teaching the students, and publishing the results of their own research.

The curriculum they have built incorporates seven themes air strategists must understand in depth. Students begin by studying the evolution of airpower in the context of military history. Because airpower is applied by people, the human dimension of airpower—leadership and moral factors—is the second major theme. A third theme—the development and application of airpower in various national cultures and geographic theaters—deepens students' understanding of history and the context from which threats may emerge. Class members also wrestle with the inter-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

relationships between technology, organization, theory, doctrine, and practice. The fifth theme—the overlapping strategic, operational, and tactical applications of airpower—is a natural transition to the main emphasis of the school: the uses of airpower across the operational spectrum. Throughout their stay, students learn and use a wide variety of conceptual and analytical tools. This broad overview only hints at a course description covering some 75 pages and including a list of some 95 books of required readings. But the curriculum comes alive by the method in which it is taught.

The School of Advanced Airpower Studies relies upon small, "no-holds-barred," graduate colloquia as a rule. Since ideas are often hammered out in very active discussion during these sessions, students often spend more than 8 hours each day reading, preparing, discussing, researching, and writing.

Each student receives comprehensive feedback. Faculty members grade the depth of the student's understanding and the soundness of his conclusions in every seminar discussion. They provide written feedback on the dozen "short" (five to eight page) papers and the final thesis research effort. Faculty committees test each student's ability to defend his thesis orally. Finally, the faculty administers comprehensive oral examinations at the end of the course.

All this activity is kept on track by a highly qualified Dean and Associate Dean. This is the team that shapes, directs, monitors, and adjusts strategic planning for the school on a day-to-day basis. Because the school is small, the Dean and Associate Dean work and plan with the faculty as a "committee of the whole." A full-scale self-appraisal is well underway and improvements are already incorporated in the program, our next class will begin in July. These improvements even extend to the facility which houses the school.

The school is housed in a new building, designed, in part, for its use. But the renovation of another building provided an opportunity for an even better location. This summer the school will relocate to refurbished facilities in the same structure that houses the Air University Library and the Air Force Historical Research Agency. Our faculty and students will be collocated with the finest military and airpower library in the world and will have immediate access to the archives of the Air Force. It came as no surprise that this year's class—which will graduate before we move—was eager to be involved in planning our new "campus."

You will find no stronger supporters of the School of Advanced Airpower Studies than the students who work so hard there. Each one is a volunteer with an exceptional professional and academic record. We require all of them to be recent graduates of an intermediate service school in residence so they may get the most from our challenging postgraduate curriculum. We do not limit our enrollment to pilots; rather we search for those with "operational" backgrounds because we believe the Air Force needs airpower strategists in many endeavors. Those who volunteer must pass two screenings. Senior faculty members from Air University look for academic potential, appropriate career experience, and indicators that future career paths would place students in positions where they would be called upon to use the special education our school provides them. The records of those who pass the first screening are then reviewed by a board of general officers. Chaired by the Commander of Air University, the board also has representatives from the Air Force Plans and Personnel Directorates as well as the Commandant of the Air Command and Staff College. The board selected a student body that would be the envy of any graduate school.

The school—a composite of the right students, taught by the right faculty, using the most effective methodologies, guided by well-qualified senior officers—has gathered strong support from across the Air Force. Even before the first class graduates, senior decisionmakers have shown they are behind us in the most striking way: by placing our graduates in key jobs. Consider these few examples. Lt. Col. Silvanus T. Gilbert will be serving on the Chief of Staff Operations Group, directly supporting the Chief, Vice Chief, and Assistant Vice Chief of the Air Force by completing special projects and conducting sensitive studies vital to the service. Lt. Col. Kurt A. Cichowski will be at Fort Bragg, serving as a Air Liaison Officer on the staff of the Joint Special Operations Command. Maj. William A. Hewitt will be a member of the Commander's Action Group at the headquarters of the Air Force's largest new command—the Air Combat Command. Other assignments are in key joint and Air Force billets as well. Each matches the synergy of the student's background the special education he has received with his new position. Because the class is so small, each assignment had the direct involvement of Air Force general officers. The assignments cover a broad range of activities, but the common thread is this: each graduate will shape the use of airpower as an instrument of national security. We want our senior leadership to continue to have confidence that the school they've so strongly supported will continue to improve.

Securing the authority to grant degrees to the graduates of the School of Advanced Airpower Studies is a logical next step. A degree recognizes the special credentials our graduates, our faculty, and our leadership have worked so hard to attain. A degree for our students can stand up to any comparison with fine post-graduate schools in the civilian sector. Our annual visit from our Board of Visitors reaffirmed that vividly just last month. A subcommittee of the Board—drawn from deans, presidents, full professors, and leaders in education and business—explored every aspect of who we are and what we do. The chairman of the subcommittee summed up the feelings of every member of his group when he said that each board member would jump at the chance to steal every member of our faculty and student body to improve his own school. The chairman also stated that even after an exhaustive look, they had no recommendations to add to what we were already doing.

Degree-granting authority is the foundation of long-term and continually improving quality. Such authority will allow us to obtain an independent, established, probing, quality review through the accreditation process. This accreditation will be much more than a snapshot of the school. It will be a minute examination of our plans for continued institutional effectiveness at every level as well. Once granted, accreditation requires that we reaffirm our standards at regular intervals through additional detailed reports and on-site inspections. But our regional accrediting association, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, requires that we first have authority to grant a degree before seeking accreditation. Recognizing the value of such authority, we have sought it from the earliest days of the school. We are following the procedures the panel outlined in Chairman Skelton's letter to the Secretary of the Air Force in September of last year as well as procedures prescribed by the administration. The Office of the Secretary of Defense has completed its review of our proposal. We began informal coordination with the Department of Education in September of last year. This process has been necessary and useful, helping us capture what is best, improve those aspects we can, and plan for the future. When DOE completes its review, the administration will transmit, for the consideration of Congress, a proposal to authorize the granting of this degree.

Degree-granting authority will do more than underwrite our investment in a high quality school. It will underwrite our investment in a high quality Air Force. No matter which alternative Air Force you envision in a future filled with uncertainties, such a force must be guided by airpower thinkers and strategists. For it will be those warrior/airmen/scholars who will have a key role in exploring the reasoned paths to continued national security.

Mr. SKELTON. Next, an old friend, Colonel Vetter.

STATEMENT OF COL. DAVID A. VETTER, U.S. MARINE CORPS, DIRECTOR, MARINE CORPS COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE; ACCOMPANIED BY LT. COL. JIM EICHER, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, LT. COL. SKIP FINK, DEAN OF ACADEMICS, MAJ. ROY ARNOLD, STUDENT

Colonel VETTER. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the panel. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to describe the progress the Marine Corps has made in establishing an advanced studies program and in obtaining degree-granting authority.

Our new School of Advanced Warfighting—we refer to it as SAW—is in its second year of operation. The school is a second year of advanced education and accelerated development for some of the very best students from the graduating Command and Staff College class. Our intent is to educate officers in the capabilities, limitations, and requirements of military institutions and how to apply that knowledge to improve the warfighting capabilities of our Nation. We produce graduates with the intellectual ability and self-confidence to work successfully through many kinds of complex military problems.

We are targeting these graduates for demanding high-impact billets in our services that will allow them to shape and meet the needs of the future. We are monitoring and tracking these grad-

uates on an individual basis throughout their careers because we feel they have something very special to contribute in each and every assignment they hold. In sum, we couldn't be more pleased with our School of Advanced Warfighting and more excited about the impact and contributions its graduates are making to improve the warfighting capabilities of our services and our Nation.

In the area of advanced degree-granting authority, we have chosen to pursue a course of action closer to the Newport model rather than the approach at Leavenworth and Maxwell. Subsequent to the implementation of our new curriculum and the other changes at the Marine Corps Command and Staff College in 1989, our intent, from the very beginning, pursuant to direction I received personally from then Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Alfred Gray, was to obtain Federal degree-granting authority to award a master's degree for all graduates of our intermediate level Command and Staff College and achieve regional accreditation through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Very simply, we believe that our intermediate level curriculum and our overall program are of sufficient breadth, rigor, and quality to merit the awarding of a free-standing master's degree. Only about one-third of our incoming students possess a master's degree, and we believe an advanced degree is warranted as appropriate recognition for the level of effort required to complete our current educational program.

I recall that the panel's original report, in fact, noted that the overriding theme of our PME schools was the graduate nature of the education. We fully recognize the magnitude of the task at hand, but we are very confident that our quest for accreditation will reach fruition.

Our confidence emanates from a number of factors. To begin with, we are proud that our Marine Corps Command and Staff College was the first of the 11 service colleges to request and receive joint accreditation by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Marine Corps Command and Staff College was assessed to be an outstanding intermediate level college with many strengths and few weaknesses.

Of significance is the fact that the comprehensive self-study developed at the college prior to the on-site visit, as well as the on-site review itself, will be of great utility as we prepare for the self-study and visitation cycles required by the Department of Educational and the Regional Accrediting Association. There is a significant correlation between these three self-studies, so we are already well along in this process.

Second, as the panel report noted so correctly, the key to effective education in our PME institutions is the quality of faculty. In the area of civilian faculty, I am very pleased to report that we have hired eight additional civilian professors this year, seven of them only last month, and we currently have funding and authorization to hire two more. I know you will be pleased, Mr. Chairman, to learn that nine of the new professors will be hired using title X authority.

When the panel visited Quantico in 1988, the civilian faculty consisted of one lone member. By this summer, we will have 15 civilian faculty at our three schools, virtually all with Ph.D.s. In addi-

tion to lowering our student-faculty ratio significantly, these civilian educators will greatly enhance our academic stature, subject matter expertise, and institutional continuity. The addition of these professors will substantially upgrade an already strong program and considerably advance our quest to obtain degree-granting authority.

Regarding the specific process and mechanics for obtaining degree-granting authority at our Command and Staff College, I can report the following progress to date. First, the Marine Corps University has formed a standing degree-granting steering committee to coordinate the multiple actions required in this endeavor and to monitor progress.

A letter was forwarded in September 1990 to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to initiate a working relationship and advise them of our intent to grant a master's degree to qualified graduates. In July, 1991, a team led by the Department of Education's Director of Higher Education Management Services conducted a most productive liaison visit to the college and provided us much encouragement and assistance.

Finally, on 7 October 1991, the President of the Marine Corps University, with the approval of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, formally requested the Department of Education undertake the program evaluation required to obtain congressional authorization for authority to bestow an advanced degree, and also requested that a delegation from the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility be sent to the college during October of this year.

At this time, we are pressing forward with our institutional self-appraisal, which is the first stage in the Department of Education's evaluation program.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate our firm belief that our intermediate level college warrants degree-granting authority and accreditation, and we are confident that we will be successful in this endeavor.

Gentlemen, I hope that I have addressed your interest and concerns. I will be very happy to answer any questions that you may have.

I would also like to introduce the officers from the Command and Staff College. Lt. Col. Jim Eicher, our Deputy Director; Lt. Col. Skip Fink, our Dean of Academics——

Mr. SKELTON. Wait a minute, I was reading a note here. Start over again on your introductions, Colonel.

Colonel VETTER. Lt. Col. Jim Eicher, who is our Deputy Director of the college; Lt. Col. Skip Fink, our academic dean; and one of our students this morning, Maj. Roy Arnold.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you, very much.

Mr. Machtley.

Mr. MACHTLEY. I will be very brief.

Colonel, is it your testimony that you have in place what you believe to be the faculty sufficient to meet the requirements of the accrediting association who would look at your program, or must you get additional funding to have more faculty members who would meet the accrediting and related course material?

Colonel VETTER. Mr. Machtley, I believe that the additional faculty will meet the accrediting standards. This will bring our total faculty to 48, which puts us right at the four-to-one ratio that both the panel and the chairman have recommended for student-faculty ratio.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Is there anything you need from us relative to additional funding for you to get the ultimate accreditation, besides the authority to go ahead?

Colonel VETTER. I think at this time the Marine Corps has identified sufficient funding. It has been a matter of personal interest to the senior leadership of the Marine Corps. While other organizations are losing structure, I think it is significant that our college, in fact, has added these 12 civilian professor positions during the next year, because they are funded, and we expect to be able to support those positions, sir.

Mr. MACHTLEY. I would ask the same questions of the Commandant of the Air Command Staff, Brigadier General Savarda.

Is your current level of faculty and course material such that you believe you could qualify under the accrediting review, or do you need additional faculty or additional course material?

General SAVARDA. No, sir, I believe the existing faculty and the course material we have is more than adequate for the accreditation process.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Thank you.

Mr. Pickett.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This graduate level program is apparently going to involve a relatively small number of students. I say relatively, because I know the Marine Corps looks like about a third the size, perhaps, of the Air Force and the Army.

I am just wondering if you think the best way to carry out the program, the most effective way, is to have three separate programs? Or is there any way that one program could provide the resource that you need in this area of a graduate program following your regular PME education program?

I would like each of you to comment on that.

General SAVARDA. Sir, if I may make a point possibly for clarification.

The Air Force school that we are seeking accreditation for, the School of Advanced Airpower Studies, is very small. It is 25 individuals. Unlike the Marine Corps that is going for their intermediate service school, we are going for an adjunct to the second year, essentially the graduate level.

I think there is something to be said for having the graduate level degree programs with a service signature. There is certainly nothing to prohibit us from generating a school or the Department from generating a school that will provide joint officers from a joint graduate level course.

I am not sure I grasp exactly how much we will gain, what the value added will be to the existing system as it is presented now because of the joint labor of each of our schools at the graduate level, but, of course, it could be done. It would be a challenging setup for faculty and curriculum to generate a degree-granting program at the tri-service level.

Mr. PICKETT. Do I understand that in the case of the Air Force, you are only going to take Air Force personnel in your graduate program and no others?

General SAVARDA. Sir, at this point, we have elected to maintain only the number of 25 for the graduate level program in the Air Force, that is correct. We have elected to do that because of the nature of the program. It is a rather unique educational program.

Realizing there will be pressure, and we have already had interest by the sister services and the international community for entry into SAAS, we felt at this point it would be prudent for the senior Air Force leadership to wait until we got ourselves well-established to include the degree-granting and accreditation process before we would consider expanding SAAS to a greater number than 25 or including sister service or international officers into that number of 25.

Were we to expand, that would open another series of questions relating to size of faculty, whether qualified faculty could be hired and brought to the school to accommodate a larger student body, and, also, possible funding requirements due to facility expansion.

Mr. PICKETT. All right. General Steele.

General STEELE. Mr. Pickett, I would reply to your question, sir, by saying that we think our program is a fairly mature one, as I mentioned, almost 17 years old. We think the great payoff from our program is the body of knowledge that is generated by student research and faculty involvement with the students' research.

There are joint aspects to that education, but the program's purpose is to train Army officers in the skills associated with the development of campaigns; planning and execution. Land combat is the purpose of our course.

We think that, first, before we can provide you a joint staff officer, we must first provide you with someone who has service competence, and our SAMS course was set up accordingly. We would like to see it maintained as it is today.

There may be a requirement for a joint SAMS course, as the chairman has mentioned in his recent article in our *Military Review* about the joint SAMS.

Mr. SKELTON. Which, by the way, is required reading.

General STEELE. Very good article, sir.

But we would like to see our particular program maintained as we have established it 17 years ago and as matured today.

Mr. PICKETT. So in your program you would only take Army personnel for graduate degrees?

General STEELE. Sir, we have had joint service officers and sister service officers involved in our program from its inception. We have Naval officers, and officers from the United States Marine Corps and the Air Force have been involved in it from its inception, in SAMS.

Since 1976, as our MMAS program has been conducted in our college, we have had over a thousand officers who have attained a degree that way. Of that number, I think about 144 of them are from the Air Force, several from the United States Navy, about 12, I think the number is, and about 32 in the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. PICKETT. Speaking specifically about your master's program, is that going to be for Army only or will you take other service personnel in there?

General STEELE. Sir, we take other people in that program.

Mr. PICKETT. What percentage, roughly? Ten percent?

General STEELE. The number of participants in the college, sir——

Mr. PICKETT. Let us confine it to the master's program alone here.

General STEELE. You mean for the school for advanced military studies?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes.

General STEELE. About 10 percent of the graduates.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you.

Colonel?

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Blaz.

Mr. PICKETT. One more.

Mr. SKELTON. Excuse me, one more. I am sorry.

Colonel VETTER. Sir, I think the service competence issue here is applicable. Just as with our various service intermediate and senior colleges, I think it is appropriate, however, that we have had a joint student body from the beginning of our School of Advanced Warfighting.

This past year we also added an international student. Our student body next year will include officers from the four services as well as two international officers.

Mr. PICKETT. Just roughly, what percentage of non-Marine Corps personnel do you have in your graduate degree program?

Colonel VETTER. Sir, again, the intent for the Marine Corps is to seek accreditation for our intermediate level Command and Staff College Program; all of our graduating students from the Command and Staff College.

We feel that our program warrants that accreditation, and we would like to bestow that credential on these officers.

Our second year students at the School of Advanced Warfighting are rewarded in other ways: By premiere assignments, by an individual tracking and monitoring system, and, thus far, 100 percent promotion rate for the Marine officers.

Mr. PICKETT. Again, how many non-Marine Corps personnel do you have in that program that we are talking about? Just roughly.

Colonel VETTER. This year in the intermediate level college, approximately one-third of the student body is non-Marine.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Blaz.

Mr. BLAZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder, are these master's degrees retroactive, for people like me who went to the school and never got one?

Mr. SKELTON. There is a statute of limitations. We don't go back to 1918.

Mr. BLAZ. 1917. You missed it by a year. We were together. Remember, you were president of the class?

I do have a question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, since the Newport model was mentioned and was used, and it is one that I am fas-

cinated with, I wonder why Newport is not represented here, just out of curiosity?

Mr. SKELTON. Excuse me?

Mr. BLAZ. Sir, I was just curious, since the Newport model has been mentioned a couple of times, and it is one that I am essentially familiar with, I was wondering why Newport is not represented today?

Mr. SKELTON. They have been here. They were among the groups 2 years ago.

Mr. BLAZ. I see.

Mr. SKELTON. They received such authority as a result of a hearing that was held some 2 years ago.

Mr. BLAZ. All right.

I have a question of the Air Force here.

When do you expect to award your first master's degree?

General SAVARDA. Sir, that is going to be totally dependent on how long it takes us to get through the process. This is our first class that will graduate the 29th of May.

We started the process of accreditation, at the direction of this panel, as early as last fall, and we have moved through the OSD wicket, into the OMB wicket, into the DOE wicket. Once we get through the self-appraisal required by DOE, as I understand the process, it will come to the Congress for the authority for degree granting.

Because of the ruling of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, which is our accrediting agency, it will not be until we get degree-granting authority that we can initiate the accreditation process.

Right now, I am anticipating 18 months to 2 years, if all goes well, before we will have the ability to offer our first master's degree, which we would hope would be retroactive to at least our first couple of classes.

Mr. BLAZ. I am glad you mentioned that, because it was really only halfway in jest. You have saved me.

No more questions.

Mr. SKELTON. Before I call Mr. Browder, let me thank the members of this panel so much for your attendance today. It is always hard to get good attendance at our hearings.

Mr. Browder.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions or observations, other than I don't want to pass up this opportunity to welcome General Savarda today——

General SAVARDA. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BROWDER. To our panel.

Thank you.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you.

I have a couple, three questions—we have a little bit of time left—to the Air Force and the Marines.

You are aware of the process of establishing approval of degree-granting authority. Would you tell us—I think you have already done this, General Savarda—Colonel Vetter, a little more in detail, where you are in the process right now, sir?

You don't have to add anything, do you, general.

General SAVARDA. No, sir, not really.

Mr. SKELTON. All right.

Colonel.

Colonel VETTER. Mr. Chairman, as I noted in my statement, we have established a working relationship with our accrediting association.

Mr. SKELTON. Let me shorten it up. General Savarda said he is about 18 months from fruition. Where are you along the line; about how far, on the educational end of it?

Colonel VETTER. I think we are in a reasonably comparable situation, sir.

Mr. SKELTON. Roughly, 18 months, something like that?

Colonel VETTER. I think that would be a target we could shoot for.

Mr. SKELTON. It appears there are some real opportunities to improve on joint experience in the courses. For each of you, how do the courses approach joint experience?

Are there any special coordinating efforts between your schools now, or do you have any future plans for coordinated efforts between your schools in the future?

Colonel, we will start with you.

Colonel VETTER. In terms of coordination between our schools, sir, I can note that during my tenure as the Director of the Command and Staff College, we have been personally visited by both the Commandant of the Air Command and Staff College as well as the——

Mr. SKELTON. Commandants don't count. I am talking about the students.

Colonel VETTER. As a matter of fact, this past year, sir, we had a graduate of the Army SAMS program. We worked with the Army to have him assigned to our faculty at the college last year.

In terms of the joint aspects of the curriculum, our curriculum is a progressive study of the framework for military institutions and how nations prepare for war. Our principal course methodology is an integrated case study. The courses are divided into a series of case studies, arranged in a chronological order.

So from the very first day, our students are critically examining both military campaigns and the institutions that fight them.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that all of the selected historical case studies that we use are examples of joint or combined warfare. The curriculum focuses on how joint and combined forces can be integrated and synchronized to achieve the commander's intent. Of course, as I indicated, we have a student body that is joint and combined as well.

Mr. SKELTON. General.

General SAVARDA. Sir, speaking only of the graduate program, SAAS, due to our infancy, there has been no student interaction as of yet, partially because of the conditions that I have described earlier as far as expansion.

However, in the development of the SAAS, we have worked closely with Leavenworth, and in discussions concerning how they achieve their degree-granting authority and accreditation and established their graduate level school.

As far as the joint perspective of the curriculum, I think it is worthy to note that the school is called the School of Advanced Air-

power Studies. This is a school that concentrates its graduate level work on the perspective of airpower and not on the service that most would think provides that, and we do that throughout the curriculum.

But I think, in answer to your fundamental question, due to the infancy of our program, we have not had the joint relationship yet with the other graduate schools that you would suggest.

Mr. SKELTON. It would be nice about a year from now if you can give us a different answer——

General SAVARDA. Yes, sir.

Mr. SKELTON. On that.

General.

General STEELE. Mr. Chairman, about 10 percent of our student body within the SAMS curriculum, over its 10 years in existence, have been from sister services; United States Air Force, United States Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. SKELTON. I did ask you, off the record a few moments ago, the type of student from the other services that you are getting, and your answer was that they were of high quality, and that continues to be true?

General STEELE. That continues to be true, sir. They are definitely of high quality, and they are going through, obviously, some very selective screening in their services before they are sent to us.

They are war fighters and we welcome their attendance at our college. They bring a great deal of experience and a different perspective into the seminars program in the School for Advanced Military Studies.

Mr. SKELTON. Are there any other questions of these gentlemen?

Well, thank you very much for your excellent testimony and traveling to be with us.

Unless there is strenuous objection from the panelists, my intention is to offer an amendment either in the full committee or on the floor that would provide a congressional charter for degree-granting authority to the Air Force School of Advanced Airpower Studies and the Marine Corps War College.

However, it would have to be contingent, gentlemen, on your meeting the accrediting standards and other requirements in the private sector as well as the Federal educational institutions, which would be helpful to you. You still have the wickets to run on the other end, but that is my present intention. I would hope that we could follow through on that.

Yes, sir, do you have a comment on that?

General SAVARDA. Yes, sir, only in the fact that before, because of the way the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools approaches the accreditation issue, before we can initiate the accreditation process, we need degree-granting authority.

Mr. SKELTON. Yes, I understand.

Thank you very much and, again, our thanks for the panel and we are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 9:55 a.m., the panel was recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY TO AWARD MASTER'S DEGREES TO GRADUATES OF THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE AND THE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
MILITARY EDUCATION PANEL,
Washington, DC, Thursday, July 23, 1992.

The panel met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m., in room 2216, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ike Skelton (chairman of the panel) presiding.

STATEMENT OF HON. IKE SKELTON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, MILITARY EDUCATION PANEL

Mr. SKELTON. Ladies and gentleman, why do we not go ahead and get started. Hopefully not, but we may have to adjourn briefly for a vote.

The House session is beginning at 9 o'clock today, which is rather unusual, but we will start. I would like to welcome you to this hearing of the Panel on Military Education. Today, we will consider authorizing the National Defense University to award master's degrees to graduates of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

The witnesses this morning are Vice Adm. John Baldwin, the President of the National Defense University; Maj. Gen. Gerald Stadler, the former Commandant—well, let us just say the ending Commandant of the National War College; Maj. Gen. George Larson, the Commandant of the Industrial College.

We also have two witnesses from the Department of Education, the Honorable John Childers, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Higher Education; and Mr. Steven Pappas, the Executive Director of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility.

We thank you all for joining us today.

I would say that John Childers and I are old friends from Harry Truman Scholarship Foundation. It is good to be with you in this forum.

I am really pleased that the panel has the opportunity to consider this request while you gentlemen from the National Defense University are still with us. You are to be commended for your actions as heads of the premier, joint professional military education institutions. I am convinced that the recommendations of the Secretary of Education for degree-granting authority are largely due to your outstanding leadership. I know that I speak for all the panel members when I say, "Well done." I know that two of you gentle-

men, John Baldwin and Gerry Stadler, go back a long time, and we commend you for your outstanding work and thank you for your great contribution to military education.

Mr. Machtley has not arrived yet.

Mr. Pickett, do you have any comments?

Mr. PICKETT. No opening statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SKELTON. Before hearing from the witnesses, I would like to include a statement in the record from Mr. Paul Jones of the U.S. General Accounting Office. The GAO has just finished examining the implementation of panel recommendations at the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. GAO reports that the schools have taken action on all of our recommendations, which is extremely gratifying to the panel, and to the gentlemen in front of us. We thank you.

Mr. Miller will provide the statement to the reporter.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAUL L. JONES, DIRECTOR, DEFENSE FORCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES, NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OFFICES DIVISION, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman and members of the panel, at your request, we have been reviewing the implementation of the panel's recommendations at the National Defense University (NDU). Today, I would like to share with the panel the results of our efforts at the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.[1] The panel made 41 recommendations to improve military education at each of the two colleges.

Overall, each college has implemented, or taken action to implement, all the recommendations pertaining to it. One partially implemented recommendation is a key recommendation pertaining to the frequency of examinations and papers and the use of letter grades for evaluating them. In addition, the recent turnovers at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the upcoming turnover of the heads of the University and the National War College appear inconsistent with the panel's recommendation on providing stability among the heads of these schools.

During the course of our review, two areas that may impact the colleges' ability to attract and retain quality civilian faculty in the future—another key concern of the panel—were brought to our attention. The first involves a preliminary Department of Defense (DOD) proposal that academic material be reviewed for accurate representation of DOD and national military policies before public release or publication. The second deals with the Government-wide ban on receiving honoraria.

Each of these areas is discussed below.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PANEL'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Both the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National War College have taken actions to implement all the panel's recommendations. Appendixes I and II summarize the recommendations by college, together with our characterization of the implementation of the recommendations.

One key recommendation dealing, in part, with the frequency and grading of examinations and papers is partially implemented. Both colleges require students to prepare various essay type papers that are critiqued by the faculty. The papers are graded as either exceeding standards, meeting standards, or failing to meet standards, but no letter grades are assigned. Instead of written examinations, students are evaluated on their classroom performance and preparation of various academic papers for their courses.

Officials at both colleges stated that they have complied with the intent of the recommendation but do not plan to administer letter grades or introduce written examinations.

FACTORS AFFECTING CIVILIAN FACULTY

Attracting and retaining quality faculty were major goals of the panel. During our review, two issues were brought to our attention that may affect the colleges' ability to attract and retain quality civilian faculty members in the future. These are (1)

[1] The third college is the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, VA.

a proposed DOD policy review of unofficial academic materials and (2) the Government-wide ban on receiving honoraria.

Policy Review of Unofficial Academic Papers

A DOD Directive (5230.9) covers official academic material that is prepared for public release or publication. It presently states that this material is subjected to a policy review by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. On the other hand, material that is not prepared for official representation is not subject to an official policy review.

On unofficial published academic material (outside the classroom), faculty and students have had wide latitude in the past to express their views, and their materials have undergone only a security review by the public affairs office. Normally, a disclaimer[2] would appear at the beginning of the material.

The proposed revision would make unofficial published academic material subject to policy reviews before public release or publication. The revision has not been approved by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

In our discussions with Public Affairs personnel responsible for the proposed change, we have been told that their intention is to review academic materials simply to ensure that DOD and national military policy is not misrepresented. However, college officials expressed concerns about the proposed change and stated that, as currently drafted, the directive could seriously hinder their efforts to attract quality faculty.

They maintain that reviewing officials could disapprove unofficial academic materials for public release or publication if they deemed the materials have inaccurately reflected official DOD and national military policies. The material would have to be revised before being approved for release. College officials stated that the revised directive would inhibit the ability to challenge policy and think independently. They also stated that the current disclaimer is sufficient to ensure that users of the material understand the role of the DOD personnel discussing the policies as well as how the material can be used.

This panel has continually emphasized that faculty and students be provided freedom to express their academic views. This emphasis was expressed in the panel's 1989 report and as recently as May 1992, when this panel discussed degree-granting authority with the heads of the intermediate colleges.

Ban on Receiving Honoraria

The recent changes in the rules governing the acceptance of honoraria by Government officials affect civilian faculty at the colleges. The most significant change precludes Federal employees at all levels from receiving compensation for such activities as making speeches or writing articles. Officials at the colleges told us that, in the past, civilian faculty members used honoraria to supplement their income. This is no longer allowed. College officials were not able to provide us with specific cases in which individuals have left the college or have refused to accept a faculty position as a result of the ban. However, they are concerned that this may constrain their ability to attract quality civilian faculty in the future.

Mr. Chairman, you and members of this panel have also addressed this issue, especially in your attempts to revise the legislation prohibiting the receipt of honoraria for academic personnel.

We are continuing to monitor both of the above areas.

TENURE OF COMMANDANTS

In its report, the panel recommended that presidents and commandants of schools serve a minimum of 3 academic years. During times of major change in the academic program, such as curriculum development, the panel noted that presidents and commandants should stay longer, perhaps 4 or 5 years, to ensure stability in the schools at the highest level.

Over the last 3 academic years—a period of major curriculum changes—the Industrial College has had two commandants. One commandant served 1 year, the other 2. The President of NDU and the Commandant of the War College have each served 3-year terms.

In addition, at the beginning of academic year 1992–1993 (which starts in August 1992), a simultaneous turnover will occur. The President of NDU and the Commandants of both colleges will be new to their positions, thereby diminishing the

[2] A sample disclaimer that appears on the material would state, "The views expressed are those of the author. They do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government."

stability the panel sought. The panel may want to consider ways to ensure stability at the professional military education institutions and discuss them with DOD.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my prepared statement.

APPENDIX I.—INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES IMPLEMENTATION OF PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

No.	Panel report[1]	Subject	Status of recommendations[2]
1	Key 1	Framework for education	I
2	Key 2	Faculty quality	I
3	Key 9	Frequency of grading of examinations and papers	PI[3]
4	I–1	Focus of education framework	I
5	II–5	Faculty teaching strategy	I
6	III–5	Joint doctrine development	I
7	III–6	Military faculty mix	PI[4]
8	III–7	Military faculty qualifications	PI[4]
9	III–8	Military student mix	PI[4]
10	III–9	Prerequisite for joint education	PI[4]
11	III–10	Report on faculty/student selection criteria and policies	I
12	III–12	Environment for joint education	I
13	III–13	Student/faculty ratios	PI[4]
14	IV–7	Standards for joint education	PI[4]
15	IV–9	Participants in joint doctrine development	I
16	IV–10	Military faculty mix	PI[4]
17	IV–12	Recruiting competent military faculty for a joint school	PI[4]
18	IV–13	Military student mix	PI[4]
19	IV–16	Responsibility for joint education	I
20	IV–31	School mission	I
21	IV–32	Types of students	PI[4]
22	V–1	Recruiting and maintaining quality faculty	I
23	V–2	Specialists/career educators	PI[4]
24	V–4	Faculty development program	I
25	V–5	Cadre of career educators	PI[4]
26	V–7	Credit for joint duty assignment	PI[4]
27	V–9	Civilian faculty quality/mix	I
28	V–10	Advanced degrees required for senior school faculty	I
29	V–11	Hiring quality civilian faculty	I
30	V–12	Student/faculty ratios	PI[4]
31	V–13	Faculty exchange with academies	I
32	V–14	Commandant selection	I
33	V–15	Commandant's tour length	I
34	V–16	Attributes of a commandant	I
35	V–17	Commandant involvement in military student selection	I
36	V–18	Military student qualifications	I
37	V–21	Limitation of professionals attending joint schools	I
38	V–23	Active/passive instruction	PI[3]
39	V–24	Rigorous performance standard	PI[3]
40	V–25	Evaluation of examinations and papers	PI[3]
41	V–26	Distinguished graduate program	I

[1] Key recommendations are those recommendations that the panel identified as key in the executive summary to its report. Recommendation I–1 appears in chapter I, entitled "Introduction." Recommendation II–5 appears in chapter II, entitled "Education Strategists." Recommendations III–5 through III–13 appear in chapter III, entitled "An Expanded Role for Joint Education." Recommendations IV–7 through IV–32 appear in chapter IV, entitled "Realigning Professional Military Education." Recommendations V–1 through V–26 appear in chapter V, entitled "Quality."

[2] Status of recommendations:
I=Implemented.
PI=Partially implemented.

[3] This recommendation was characterized as partially implemented because ICAF does not have letter grading as the panel recommended.

[4] This recommendation is beyond ICAF's control to unilaterally implement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX II.—NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE'S IMPLEMENTATION OF PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

No.	Panel report[1]	Subject	Status of recommendations[2]
1	Key 1	Establishing framework for education	I
2	Key 2	Faculty quality	I
3	Key 9	Frequency and grading of examinations and papers	PI[4]
4	I–1	Focus of educational framework	I
5	II–5	Faculty teaching strategy	I
6	III–5	Joint doctrine development	I
7	III–6	Military faculty mix	I
8	III–7	Faculty qualifications and student/faculty ratios	PI[3]
9	III–8	Student mix	I
10	III–9	Prerequisite for joint education	PI[3]
11	III–10	Faculty/student selection criteria and policies	I
12	III–12	Environment for joint education	I
13	III–13	Student/faculty ratios	PI[3]
14	IV–1	Focus of strategy by school	I
15	IV–7	Standards for joint education	I
16	IV–9	Participants in joint doctrine development	I
17	IV–10	Military faculty mix	PI[3]
18	IV–12	Recruiting competent joint school faculty	I
19	IV–13	Student mix	I
20	IV–16	Responsibility for joint education	I
21	V–1	Recruiting and maintaining quality faculty	I
22	V–2	Specialists/career educators	I
23	V–4	Faculty development program	I
24	V–5	Cadre of career educators	I
25	V–7	Joint duty credit	I
26	V–8	Retired officers and dual compensation law	I
27	V–9	Civilian faculty credentials	I
28	V–10	Advanced degrees for senior school faculty	I
29	V–11	Incentives to hire civilian faculty	I
30	V–12	Student/faculty ratios	PI[3]
31	V–13	Faculty exchange with academies	I
32	V–14	Commandant selection	I
33	V–15	Commandant's tour length	I
34	V–16	Commandant/President as general/flag officer and involvement in instruction	I
35	V–17	Commandant involvement in student selection	I
36	V–18	Military student qualifications	I
37	V–21	Officers in professional category attending joint schools	PI[3]
38	V–23	Active/passive instruction and grading	PI[3]
39	V–24	Rigorous performance standard	PI[4]
40	V–25	Evaluation of examinations and papers	PI[4]
41	V–26	Distinguished graduate program	I

[1] Key recommendations are those recommendations that the panel identified as key in the report's executive summary. Recommendation I–1 appears in panel report, chapter I, entitled "Introduction." Recommendation II–5 appears in panel report, chapter II, entitled "Education Strategists." Recommendations III–5 through III–13 appear in panel report, chapter III, entitled "An Expanded Role for Joint Education." Recommendations IV–1 through IV–16 appear in panel report, chapter IV, entitled "Realigning Professional Military Education." Recommendations V–1 through V–26 appear in panel report, chapter V, entitled "Quality."

[2] Status of recommendations:
I=Implemented.
PI=Partially implemented.
NI=Not implemented.

[3] These recommendations are beyond the college's ability to implement unilaterally.

[4] These recommendations are partially implemented because the college does not use letter grades as recommended by the panel.

Mr. SKELTON. I will tell you what might be best, to ask the gentleman from the Department of Education to testify first. It may shorten our hearing somewhat. Admiral Baldwin, Major Stadler and General Larson, we will get to you shortly thereafter.

Mr. Childers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEMENT OF JOHN B. CHILDERS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. CHILDERS. Congressmen, Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, it is a pleasure to be here this morning to talk about the Department of Education's process for implementing the Federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions. This policy has been in effect since December 1954. We will also describe our review of the National Defense University's request for degree-granting authority.

The National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility held a hearing on May 4, 1992, at which the Advisory Committee unanimously voted to recommend to the Secretary of Education that the National Defense University be granted its request for degree-granting authority. The Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, has concurred with this recommendation that the National War College be allowed to award the degree of Master of Science in National Security Strategy and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces be allowed to award the degree of Master of Science in National Resource Strategy. That recommendation of the Secretary was forwarded to OMB and the National Defense University on July 2, 1992.

To assist the Secretary of Education in making his decision, an impartial review team of educators was asked to review documents submitted by the National Defense University as well as to make a site visit to the university from March 22 through March 25 of this year. This visit, and the subsequent formal hearing before the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation, was the culmination of the Department of Education's role in a process the National Defense University began when it first contacted the Education Department in 1990.

I would like to share with you and the panel a written report of that site visit because I believe it will give you an idea of the thoroughness with which the review team carried out its task and the seriousness with which it took its responsibility. I would like to turn, Mr. Chairman, if I could, to Mr. Pappas, who is the Executive Director of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, to outline the site visit and its results.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Pappas.

STATEMENT OF STEVEN G. PAPPAS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION AND INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Mr. PAPPAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the panel.

The team for the site visit was composed of Dr. Myrna Matranga, a Professor of Education in the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Reno; Dr. Bernard Fryshman, Professor of Physics at New York Institute of Technology; and Sister Mary Andrew Matesich, the President of Ohio Dominican College in Columbus, OH. They were assisted by me as the Executive Director of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility from the Department of Education, and by Mr. James Dougherty, an Education Program Specialist, also from the Department of Education.

Doctors Matranga, Matesich and Fryshman are members of the National Advisory Committee, and constituted the formal review committee delegated to determine whether the colleges complied with the Federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions. Dr. Matranga served as chairperson.

To accomplish this 3-day site visit, the team reviewed the institutional self-studies of each of the two colleges for which the National Defense University is seeking degree-granting authority. In addition to the initial paper review of the self-study, the team visited the campus to review evidentiary materials in support of the four criteria in the Federal policy granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions. If I may, these criteria are:

One, "that the conferring of the authority to grant the graduate degrees in question is essential to the accomplishment of the program objectives of the applying agency."

Two, "that the graduate program in question and/or the graduate degrees proposed cannot be obtained on satisfactory terms through the facilities of existing non-Federal institutions of higher education."

Three, "that the graduate program conducted by the applying agency meets the standards for the degree or degrees in question which are met by similar programs in non-Federal institutions of higher education."

Fourth, "that the administration of the graduate program concerned is such that the faculty and students are free to conduct their research activities as objectively, as freely, and in as unbiased a manner as that found in other non-Federal agencies of higher education. The existence of an advisory committee of educators from regularly constituted institutions shall be regarded as some evidence of the safeguarding of the freedom of inquiry. Accreditation by an appropriate accrediting body, if such exists, shall be regarded as another safeguard."

In carrying out this on-site review, the team conducted extensive interviews with most of the senior administration of the National Defense University, the National War College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Additionally, team members interviewed a member of the Board of Visitors as well as a member of the Joint Staff. The team also had extensive discussions with curriculum development committees, and faculty and students in groups informally and one-on-one. All members of the team attended classes both in the core curriculum and in the electives.

The team reviewed student essays, course syllabi, course evaluations, student personnel records, minutes of Board of Visitors meetings, and external reviews of academic programs of both schools. We also visited the library and were briefed by the director of the Wargaming facility and the director of the Institute for National Strategic Studies.

The review team conducted a thorough analysis of its observations and findings and unanimously recommended to the full National Advisory Committee that the NDU be authorized the degrees requested. The committee accepted this recommendation unanimously.

I would like to add that our review was highly favorable to the academic curriculum, the faculty, the administration, and especially the students. Our compliments especially go to Admiral Baldwin and his outstanding administrative staff, all of whom made this full review a model and standard for all future reviews of such institutions or programs.

If you have any other questions concerning the site visit or any part of the procedure the Department uses for determining whether the Federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions is met, we will be pleased to answer them.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you.

Mr. Childers, do you have anything to add?

Mr. CHILDERS. No, I do not, sir.

Mr. SKELTON. General Larson, I am remiss in not recognizing the fact that you too will be leaving. Am I correct, sir?

General LARSON. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SKELTON. Well, I apologize, and wish you well in your future and thank you for your contribution to your school and to these efforts. The two gentlemen to your right just sang the praises, whether you know it or not, of all three of you. We could not have had anything better said than the high quality of marks that you just got. You know, we talk about grading. You just got graded "A," all three of you. So thank you.

Admiral Baldwin.

STATEMENT OF VICE ADM. JOHN A. BALDWIN, JR., PRESIDENT, NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY

Admiral BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pickett, I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss the National Defense University's programs and goals in the process of accreditation. But, first, I would like to express my personal appreciation to you and the other panel members for your outstanding support for professional military education.

I believe there has been major improvement in military education in the past few years, and the majority of these improvements are associated directly with the efforts of this panel and, of course, the support of the chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the university's executive agents, the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy.

I would like to mention very briefly, somewhat aside from the degree-granting business, but a key part of it is that the title X authorization, which this panel was and you, Mr. Chairman, were instrumental in enacting, has been a tremendous boon to both colleges. We have increased our faculty authorizations by 19 professors under the title X authority. We have also increased the number of loaners from other agencies by five. So we have substantially increased both the Industrial College and the National War College faculties. Not only have we increased our numbers, but I believe we have hired and are hiring outstanding civilian faculty members.

I appreciate very much the efforts of the Department of Education and Mr. Steve Pappas and everything he has done to support us. We were very pleased with the outcome, of course, and I have discussed this matter at some length with General Powell,

and he has authorized me to proceed with the process of accreditation, and I think he is very supportive of what we are about and will continue to be.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of both colleges, and believe they deserve to be accredited, and have degree-granting authority, and I would welcome your support. Again, let me express my deep appreciation for your interest and support of PME and the opportunity to appear before this panel and I would be pleased to respond to any questions you may have.

Mr. SKELTON. Thanks, Admiral.

General Stadler.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. GERALD P. STADLER, FORMER COMMANDANT, NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

General STADLER. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pickett, I really appreciate the opportunity to have a few moments this morning with the panel. I think I should first report out to you that the common interest we have had over the time that I have been there, that the students who pass through the War College this year as well as students of the past continue to equip themselves very well, and that is really the focus of what the college is all about. I think their performance as students, but also their performance in staffs and commands around the world, to include Desert Shield and Desert Storm, attest to the kind of education that they are getting there.

You have already heard comments concerning the faculty, and the only thing I would add to that is that we have been as aggressive in pursuing top quality military faculty as well as the civilian faculty. I realize that that's been the focus of title X, and the borrowing of faculty. But I think that is just as important as the pursuit of top quality civilian faculty as well, and I think we have been very successful in that regard.

Probably the thing that I would say is going to demand the most of our time and energy in the next few years is sustaining the support structure that makes the college run in the face of declining resources for all of the Federal military structure and competing demands, and we are going to have to work hard to do that.

But the last thing I would say is just thanks and grateful appreciation to the vigorous support of the university, the Joint Staff, the Department of Education in this particular instance, and last but not least, the Panel on Military Education, in creating the environment so that we can pursue our mission, pursue our goals.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you, General.

General Larson.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. GEORGE W. LARSON, JR., COMMANDANT, INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

General LARSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the panel, I could not be happier to serve in this particular assignment because of what I have learned and what I walk away with. I am convinced that the ascending leaders that we educate are better prepared than I was, or perhaps than General Stadler was at that particular point in time in our careers. That is true because of the excellence

of the university and our college faculty. That leaves me feeling very good about where we are going.

I am not trying to say that it is an easy path to take. We do have obstacles to overcome. We need to bring on board the Defense Acquisition University as part of the ICAF, in a partnership that will work and complement each other, and I am sure we can do that.

I thank the Department of Education for recognizing the excellence of the university and the colleges. I am convinced that it is there, and they are helping to bring that forward. I see nothing but good from the National Defense University and the colleges, and that is predominantly because of the support of yourself, the panel, and the Congress, and I thank you very much to serve in this capacity.

Thank you.

Mr. SKELTON. Well, thank you, General. We certainly wish you well in your future endeavors.

Mr. Pickett and I are both beneficiaries of having attended law school. Back when we started this endeavor in late 1987, early 1988, it was my desire to make these schools as tough as law school. If we are going to have people defend us, they ought to have the rigor and professional knowledge that we felt that we had to absorb through those 3 years of post-graduate work that we did.

Really what it enables you to do, even though you forget all the details of law, and in your case, the details of military science, it enables you to ask the right question. If you can do that, if you can ask the right question at the right time, you are going to win your battle, make the right decision, win the war. You make the right decisions to do so. So that's really what we are all about. I am, frankly, thrilled, Mr. Childers, when you and Mr. Pappas speak about quality and the rigor that you have found in the schools.

If there is anything that bothered me, it was that some of the schools were a place to have a year off with your family. That maybe is not all that bad, but you would not do that in any other profession. I think that you have fulfilled your mission not only in the letter, but in the spirit. I appreciate that. You gentlemen should be commended because these gentlemen to your right give you a good grade.

I have a couple of questions.

We are dealing with this issue of academic freedom in our Professional Military Educational schools, and I understand there is a proposed part of the defense directive, I think some in title 5230.9, that would require official policy review of academic material prepared for public release.

Mr. Childers, do you have any thoughts on this? How would that interfere with the academics, not necessarily of these schools, but all of our professional military educational schools?

Mr. CHILDERS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar precisely with this proposed policy, but I will just say that the official policy in statute that the Department of Education is governed by is that the Department of Education does not get involved in curriculum matters. The curriculum and the academic content of materials taught at our colleges and universities is not a subject matter that the Department of Education gets involved in, in any way, to try and determine or standardize. So that would be a Federal agency

determining content. Academic content of courses would certainly be not in keeping with the statute that governs our activities in the Department of Education.

Mr. SKELTON. Would Mr. Pappas care to add anything to that?

Mr. PAPPAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the Federal policy that we use to review institutions for degree-granting authority it specifically asks us to review those Federal institutions to assure ourselves that the standards of academic freedom that pertain in military institutions are equivalent to what pertains in the outside, and in the non-Federal and in civilian institutions.

I would say that people should be very prudent before they recommend such an activity, and see whether or not that corresponds to what goes on in a civilian institution. Just on the surface, it sounds like it may be restricting people's academic freedom. I think we would have to look and see how it would apply, but it does seem to be a little bit more restrictive than the existing policy right now.

At the same time I think we recognize the fact that, especially in an institution where materials that are classified are used, that the faculty and the administration exercise prudence in what they write in their books and in their articles for official publication.

But I think that the implication is, especially if a Federal institution seeks accreditation from a regional accrediting body, that the faculty and the administration have all the rights and privileges that would pertain in a civilian institution, and that means probably not too much review of their written materials.

Mr. SKELTON. Admiral Baldwin, if this proposed directive is approved and would require official policy review, would that interfere with your attracting topnotch people under title X from the civilian world.

Admiral BALDWIN. As Mr. Pappas said, with lots of these regulations that are enacted, it depends on how it is implemented, but it does have the potential to do that.

Mr. SKELTON. Have you made this known to the Department of Defense?

Admiral BALDWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SKELTON. Did they hear you?

Admiral BALDWIN. Yes, sir. The Military Education Coordinating Committee—which I think you are familiar with, that is comprised of all of the commandants and presidents of several service colleges and is chaired by the Director of the Joint Staff—and we have on two occasions expressed concern about the direction that this potential regulation was taking and the Joint Staff and the chairman have come on line with the Secretary of Defense's staff to ask that it not be enacted, and so far it has been held at bay.

Mr. SKELTON. As you know, the Ethics in Government Act prohibits at the present time the acceptance of honoraria. We have attempted to rectify this with a provision in the authorization bill that we passed here in the House which exempts faculty and students and our professional military institutions from this restriction.

Do any of you have any comments that would add any additional light to the issue?

Admiral BALDWIN. I think that is, if I may, Mr. Chairman, a fairly straightforward kind of thing to the degree that it has been appealed. A judge found that it was unconstitutional and that has been appealed. So it is working through the court.

Honoraria, of course, in the academic world are normal sort of thing, and it is restrictive, it seems to me, for academicians not to be able to avail themselves of that sort of privilege. But my impression is that there has been no effect, no practical effect to date with the faculty, and I would defer to my two commandants, or one ex-commandant and one current commandant to comment if they would like to.

Mr. SKELTON. The panel is interested in the certification and accreditation process. Mr. Pappas, in 25 words or less can you explain the difference between the two?

Mr. PAPPAS. Yes, sir. I might use the analogy of a graduate teaching assistant and a full professor. The degree-granting authority that is awarded by the Federal Government for an institution is like admitting a student to graduate school and then asking him to teach. What it does is it recognizes their ability. It allows them to interact with other students and to teach the particular subject. It does not mean that they are full professors.

The self-study that we asked them to do is just like a self-study that an undergraduate student is asked to, let us say, submit to a graduate program for admission.

In accreditation, instead of meeting just the minimum requirements, which is what is expected in the degree-granting authority, the institution in question goes before institutions of their peers, and the minimum requirements that is required of them is the minimum requirements that is required of all accredited institutions in that universe. That is like a graduate student finally getting his Ph.D. so that the work he does in doing the self-study now instead of for entrance into graduate school is for getting his graduate degree and defending—it is like his comprehensive examination.

Once accreditation is granted, then that institution joins the universe of accredited institutions of that accrediting body that accredits them. They are two different things. You can have degree-granting authority and not be accredited. In the world of academia students that graduate from an institution with degree-granting authority but not accreditation do not have the rights and privileges and are not given the respect that somebody that graduates from an accredited institution has.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you.

Admiral Baldwin, National Defense University depends on the Army for its budget; is that correct?

Admiral BALDWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SKELTON. Is the Army supportive of the title X legislation concerning the hiring of civilian faculty?

Admiral Baldwin. Yes, sir, they are.

Mr. SKELTON. Do you have any problem at all?

Admiral BALDWIN. No undue problems. Every now and then we work through the bureaucracy of actually getting the authorization. But I am pleased to be able to tell you that in every case the Army

has always come through both in terms of authorization and in terms of funding.

Mr. SKELTON. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Let me tell you this. As you know, we have already passed our bill in the House. It is my intention to try to help you this year if at all possible. I hope that you will use your good offices to follow through and suggest on the Senate side that the Senate include in its bill this authority. We would, of course, expect, if that is the case, to recede to their language or to work it out any other way in conference if we could. I think, Mr. Childers, this would meet with your recommendations and approval; is that correct?

Mr. CHILDERS. Sir, the Secretary of Education has approved this proposal and has officially transmitted that to the Office of Management and Budget. So the Department is clearly on record on this issue.

Mr. SKELTON. Fine. We may need a copy of that or something similar if you can make a mental note of that, Mr. Childers, for your use.

Mr. CHILDERS. Be happy to.

Mr. SKELTON. I would like to get this done. We will not get into the issue of retroactivity, because that deals with the local accreditation groups. So we will let you worry about that on your own. I am not familiar with what other institutions have or have not done.

Thank you so much. This has been very helpful, and especially, Admiral Baldwin and Gerry Stadler. General Larson, we wish you well. We hope to see lots of you in the days and years ahead. Thank you all.

[Whereupon, at 9:35 a.m., the panel was adjourned.]

[The following prepared statements were submitted for the record:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN B. CHILDERS

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to talk about the Department of Education's process for implementing the Federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions. This policy has been in effect since December 1954. We will also describe our review of the National Defense University's (NDU's) request for degree-granting authority.

The National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility (NACAIE) held a formal hearing on May 4, 1992, at which time the Committee voted unanimously to recommend to the Secretary of Education that the National Defense University be granted its request for degree-granting authority. The Secretary of Education concurred with the recommendation that the National War College be allowed to award the degree of Master of Science in National Resource Strategy. That recommendation was forwarded to OMB and to the NDU on July 2, 1992.

To assist the Secretary in making his decision, an impartial review team of educators was asked to review documents submitted by the NDU as well as to make a site visit to the University from March 22 to March 25, 1991. This visit, and the subsequent formal hearing before the full NACAIE, was the culmination of the Department of Education's part in a process NDU began when it first contacted ED in 1990.

I would like to share with you a written report of that site visit because I believe it will give you an idea of the thoroughness with which the team carried out its task and the seriousness with which it took its responsibility. I will turn to Mr. Steven G. Pappas, Executive Director of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, to outline the site visit and its results.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEVEN G. PAPPAS

The team for the site visit to the National Defense University (NDU) was composed of Dr. Myrna Matranga, Professor, College of Education, University of Nevada, Reno; Dr. Bernard Fryshman, Professor of Physics, New York Institute of Technology; and Sister Mary Andrew Matesich, President, Ohio Dominican College. Dr. Matranga serves as chairperson. They were assisted by me as the Executive Director of the National Advisory Committee for Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility (NACAIE), U.S. Department of Education, and by Mr. James Dougherty, Education Program Specialist, U.S. Department of Education.

Doctors Matranga, Matesich, and Fryshman are members of the NACAIE, and constituted the formal Review Committee delegated to determine whether the colleges complied with the *Federal Policy Governing the Granting of Academic Degrees by Federal Agencies and Institutions* (December 23, 1954).

To accomplish this site visit, the team reviewed the institutional self-studies of each of the two colleges for which the National Defense University is seeking degree-granting authority. In addition to an initial paper review of the self-studies, the team visited the campus to review evidentiary materials in support of the four criteria in the Federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions. The criteria are:

(1) "that the conferring of the authority to grant the graduate degrees in question is essential to the accomplishment of the program objectives of the applying agency."

(2) "that the graduate program in question and/or the graduate degrees proposed cannot be obtained on satisfactory terms through the facilities of existing non-Federal institutions of higher education."

(3) "that the graduate program conducted by the applying agency meets the standards for the degree or degrees in question which are met by similar programs in non-Federal institutions of higher education."

(4) "that the administration of the graduate program concerned is such that the faculty and students are free to conduct their research activities as objectively, as freely, and in as unbiased a manner as that found in other non-Federal institutions of higher education. The existence of an advisory committee of educators from regularly constituted institutions shall be regarded as some evidence of the safeguarding of freedom of inquiry. Accreditation by an appropriate accrediting body, if such exists, shall be regarded an another safeguard."

In carrying out this on-site review, the team conducted extensive interviews with most of the senior administration of the National Defense University (NDU), the National War College (NWC), and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF). Additionally, team members interviewed a member of the Board of Visitors (BOV) as well as a member of the Joint Staff. The team also had extensive discussions with curriculum development committees, faculty and students both in informal groups and one-on-one. All members of the team attended classes both in the core curriculum and in the electives.

The team reviewed student essays, course syllabi, course evaluations, student personnel records, minutes of Board of Visitor meetings, and external reviews of the academic programs of both schools. We also visited the library and were briefed by the director of the Wargaming facility and the director of the Institute for National Strategic Studies.

The review team conducted a thorough analysis of its observations and findings and unanimously recommended to the full NACAIE that NDU be authorized the degree in question. The full NACAIE accepted this recommendation unanimously.

I would like to add that our review was highly favorable of the NDU's academic curriculum, faculty, administration, and especially its students.

If you have any questions concerning the site visit or any other part of the procedure the Department uses for determining whether the Federal policy governing granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions is met, we will be pleased to answer them.

REPORT OF AN ON-SITE VISIT—A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On Sunday, March 22, 1992, Dr. Myrna Matranga, Professor, College of Education, University of Nevada, Reno and Sister Mary Andrew Matesich, President, Ohio Dominican College assisted by Mr. Steven G. Pappas, Executive Director of the National Advisory Committee for Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility (NACAIE), U.S. Department of Education and Mr. James Dougherty, Education Pro-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

gram Specialist, U.S. Department of Education met to initiate a review of the National War College and the Industrial College for the Armed Forces.

On Tuesday, March 24, the group was joined by Dr. Bernard Fryshman, Professor of Physics, New York Institute of Technology.

Drs. Matranga, Matesich, and Fryshman are members of the NACAIE, and constitute a formal Review Committee delegated to determine whether the colleges comply with the *Federal Policy Governing the Granting of Academic Degrees by Federal Agencies and Institutions* (December 23, 1954). Dr. Matranga served as chairperson.

Scope of the Review

To accomplish this site-visit, the team reviewed the institutional self-studies of each of the two colleges for which the National Defense University is seeking degree granting authority. In addition to an initial paper review of the self-studies, the team visited the cam· ·s to review evidentiary materials in support of the four criteria in the Federal policy governing the granting of academic degrees by Federal agencies and institutions.

In the carrying out of this on-site review the team conducted extensive interviews with most of the senior administration of the National Defense University (NDU), the National War College (NWC), and Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF). Additionally, team members interviewed a member of the Board of Visitors (BOV) as well as a member of the Joint Staff. Also, members had extensive discussions with curriculum development committees, faculty and students both in groups, informally, and one-on-one. All members of the team attended classes both in the core curriculum and in the electives.

The team reviewed student essays, course syllabi, course evaluations, student personal records, minutes of Board of Visitor meetings, and external reviews of the academic programs of both schools, visited the library and were briefed by the Director of the Wargaming facility and the Director of the Institute for National Strategic Studies.

The review was followed by a thorough evaluation by the Subcommittee of their observations and conclusions and by unanimous consent, they we make the following recommendation to the full body of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility:

> That the Review Subcommittee established by the Secretary of Education received and reviewed evidence by the National Defense University and that the following four criteria have been met:
>
> > (1) That the conferring of the authority to grant the graduate degrees in question is essential to the accomplishment of the programs objectives of the applying agency.

The subcommittee of the NACAIE found that the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces supports their assertion that the awarding of Master's degrees is essential to the attainment of stated objectives. The program objectives of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces are stated clearly in the self-study documents and are well understood by faculty, staff and students at the institutions. These objectives require leadership training for increasing collaboration among professional military organizations and civilian organizations. ICAF has just acquired additional responsibilities for the education of civilian acquisitions experts. These evolving objectives support the judgment that degree granting authority is essential for HWC and IEAP.

The leadership of the National Defense University has recognized this need as documented in the Board of Visitors minutes for the May 1990 meeting (acceptance by consensus of the decision to pursue authority to award appropriate master's degrees) and the May 1991 meeting (status report on efforts to receive this authority). This is confirmed in the 1991 annual report of the president of NDU to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (NWC Exhibit 146 p. 38).

Reasons given in the NWC and ICAF self-study documents for the need to award degrees were iterated frequently in campus interviews. In addition the following reasons emerged in the course of the visiting team review:

> The voluntary nature of today's military and the need to attract the most able officer to leadership positions in national strategy requires a civilian credential, a degree, as evidence of completion of advanced leadership education.
>
> It is essential for the National Defense University to join the community of academic institutions in order to safeguard its outstanding curricula and administration from the dangers of insularity, isolation and inbreeding. The normal processes of accreditation, review and membership activities associated with de-

gree-granting status will provide the needed interaction with the greater academic community.

(2) That the graduate program in question and/or the graduate degrees proposed cannot be obtained on satisfactory terms through the facilities of existing non-Federal institutions of higher education.

The National War College proposes to award the Master of Science in National Security Strategy. The Industrial College of the Armed Services proposes to offer the Master of Science in National Resource Strategy. These are professional degree programs for senior military leaders and civilians exercising leadership in national strategic areas.

In the judgment of the Subcommittee these degrees cannot be obtained in existing non-Federal institutions for the following reasons:

The programs are based on a joint multi-service perspective in order to educate student bodies which include members of all the military services as well as civilians with high-level experience in Federal agencies. Their focus on the role of all the services and related agencies in national security decisionmaking and resource strategy could not be duplicated elsewhere.

The programs require constant revision to stay current and immediate in rapidly changing circumstances, a feature which is essential to train future decisionmakers. This requires access to the views of top domestic and foreign policymakers and to current data from the Department of Defense and other agencies as well as certain classified materials. It also depends on the NDU's extensive network of contacts with Government agencies, think tanks and private corporations.

(3) That the graduate program conducted by the applying agency meets the standards for the degree or degrees in question which are met by similar programs in non-Federal institutions of higher education.

As noted, the Subcommittee reviewed the graduate programs offered by the NWC and the ICAF. This review included interviews with faculty and students, extensive observation of classes in session, careful reading of student work and an examination of the methods used by the respective colleges in assessing student achievement. The Subcommittee was unanimous in concluding that the graduate programs in question meet the standards for the master's degree which are met by similar programs in non-Federal institutions of higher education.

(4) That the administration of the graduate program concerned is such that the faculty and students be free to conduct their research activities as objectively, as freely, and in as unbiased a manner as that found in other non-Federal institutions of higher education. The existence of an advisory committee of educators from regularly constituted institutions shall be regarded as some evidence of the safeguarding of freedom of inquiry. Accreditation by an appropriate accrediting body, if such exists, shall be regarded as another safeguard.

The subcommittee found numerous references to fostering a climate of academic freedom within the policy and operational documents of the NDU. Additionally, NDU has adopted a policy further augmenting its implementation of academic freedom, namely the concept of nonattribution. This policy is documented in each colleges' faculty and student handbooks as well as course syllable and other institutional documents. Interviews with faculty and students, as well as administrators, confirm the seriousness accorded the ideal of academic freedom and established that the nonattribution policy does indeed enhance this goal. Observation of classroom discussion showed that free and unrestricted inquiry and thought is characteristic of the education enterprise.

Further, the NDU has a Board of Visitors composed of distinguished members of the military and civilian communities which aid the president of the university in a variety of matters related to the mission and operation of the National Defense University.

67-260 (44)

ISBN 0-16-040960-8